

**Minutes From a Meeting of the Concordia Council on Student Life
Held on December 3, 1999
Loyola Campus AD 131 10:00am**

Present: Dr. D. Boisvert, Chair, Ms J. Hackett, Secretary, Mr. A. Beedassy, Mr. R. Boncore, Ms J. Calder, Mr. R. Côté, Mr. W. Curran, Ms M. Drew, Ms S. Friesinger, Mr. P. Gilmore, Dr. S.M. Graub, Mr. C. Jacob, Dr. J. Jans, Ms S. Navidad, Mr. D. Prejli, Ms T. Ryan, Mr. P. Taylor, Ms L. Lipscombe, Ms L. Toscano

Absent with Regrets: Mr. H. Zarins, Ms A. Kerby, Dr. F. Shaver, Ms C. Boujaklian, Mr. B. MacIver

Delegates: Mr. P. Aube represented Mr. V. Francisco, Mr. B. Vroom represented Ms K. Hedrich, Ms C. Hedrich represented Ms G. Korn

Absent: Ms. K. Stewart

1. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Dr. Boisvert asked that under New Business, the item "Profile, Vice-Rector, Services", be added as point 8.1. Ms Navidad asked that under Student Life Issues, the item, VA Building, be added as point 6.2. A motion to approve the agenda as amended was made by Ms Navidad and seconded by Mr. Jacobs.

The Motion was carried unanimously

2. REMARKS FROM THE CHAIR

Dr. Boisvert indicated that the preparation of the 2000-03 budget is going well and that he hoped to table it at Council in February.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 29, 1999

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Ms Navidad and seconded by Mr. Jacob.

The Motion was carried unanimously

4. BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES

4.1 I/EAC Review Committee: Mr. Pruden drew Council's attention to the recommendations of the I/EAC working Group to CCSL, which had been previously distributed. The gist of the recommendations is that the I/EAC has decided to hold a referendum to institute a per credit fee. In the interim, the recommendation is that the I/EAC should continue to receive funding from CCSL for the next three-year budget cycle. The Dean of Students Office will administer these funds. This referendum must be held by the end of October, 2001. Mr. Gilmore, seconded by Ms Friesinger made the following motion:

Be it resolved that Council approve the I/EAC Working Group recommendations to CCSL.

Mr. Côté clarified that although the fee referendum **must be held** by October 2001, it can be held **earlier**. After a brief discussion, Dr. Boisvert asked if Council was ready to vote on the motion. Council had no objection.

The Motion was carried unanimously

4.2 Student Participation in University Governance: Mr. Pruden informed Council that the committee had met recently and had a very productive meeting. The committee, with one objection, agreed to the implementation of transcript notation as one of the ways to reward student involvement. The committee hoped to present at the February CCSL meeting information on the possibility of tuition waivers as another form of rewarding participation. The committee recommended that a catalogue be made available listing all the committees that students may sit on. Mr. Pruden indicated he has started collecting this information. The committee wished to have Council's approval to proceed with these recommendations. However, Council felt it did not have enough information or background on this issue to endorse or approve any recommendations. There were serious concerns expressed on "the hows and the wheresores". Questions were asked concerning the selection procedures, implementation considerations, and the very important issue of standards. Dr. Boisvert felt it was prudent to have a document presented for Council's discussion and approval before any decision could be taken. Council was in agreement. Mr. Pruden agreed to have a formal presentation from the committee for deliberation at the February CCSL meeting.

4.3 Draft Policy on Demonstration: Dr. Boisvert drew Council's attention to the document which had been distributed previously. He explained that this draft policy was a response to the needs of the University and its community with respect to demonstrations or protests. He reminded Council that this draft policy was brought to Council for its input, not for its approval. The Rector's Cabinet is responsible for approval of policies. However Dr. Boisvert felt it was important that the policy reflect input from CCSL and he welcomed feedback, especially from the student caucus.

The following points in the draft policy in particular were problematic for the student caucus:

a) "Purpose

....aims to prevent activities which physically obstruct access to the University property or in any undue manner prevent the University from carrying out its instructional, research, public service or administrative functions"

b) "Procedures for Demonstration

2. *Individuals planning a demonstration shall complete a Demonstration Registration Form and arrange for a meeting with the either the Dean of Students (in the case of students) or the Director of Security (in the case of other groups) to discuss the arrangements for this event"*

c) "3. Participants in demonstrations shall not:

- i. *Gather in such a fashion as to physically hinder entrances to, exits from or passageways within any University Building or other structure or hinder the normal flow of pedestrian or vehicular traffic on or to the campus;*
- iv *Congregate or assemble within any University Building or on University property in such a fashion as to disrupt the University/s normal functions;"*

Mr. Jacobs felt that these points, in particular 3.i & 3.iv, would hinder the effectiveness of any protest. The CSU protest in November held recently outside the Bishop Court Building would have been in violation of this policy. Mr. Taylor said the intent of the document was noble but the policy effectively takes the teeth out of any student protest. It would curtail any impact a student demonstration or protest may be trying to make. Dr. Boisvert felt that the spirit of the policy was not to forbid demonstrations but rather to facilitate them. The policy also endeavors to ensure that the rights and safety of the whole university community are respected while upholding the right of freedom of expression. However, he agreed that these are always in delicate balance. Dr. Boisvert felt the document tries to define the policy as broadly as possible but at the same time guarantee flexibility. He felt it was important that the policy not be black and white so as to be able to respond effectively and fairly to various situations. Mr. Prejli felt that if the policy is not clear, interpretation could vary resulting in legal implications.

Mr. Taylor drew Council's attention to the purpose statement. He felt this statement was contradictory as legal protests against a particular service or function of the university will result in a disruption. That is the whole point of a protest. He felt the policy bordered on being a bit repressive. Dr. Boisvert said perhaps the policy should better reflect the principles of what can be done, rather than what is forbidden.

Ms Navivdad asked how the policy protects the protesters. Mr. Aube answered that with respect to police intervention, security has no control or authorization on what occurs on public property. He also informed council that the police may enter university property if they observe an infraction on public property and are considered in "hot pursuit" of an individual. He reiterated that it is Security's responsibility to liaise with the police with respect to University policy. However, he reiterated that security's actions would be in accordance with directives of the Dean of Students or the Vice -Rector, Services.

Mr. Taylor felt that an open and honest communication between the students and administration was very important. He expressed concern that there were surveillance tapes made of the recent student demonstrations. These acts create an environment of suspicion. There was a brief discussion on the incident that arose between student protestors and the police on November 4th. Dr. Boisvert said that the policy needs to specify the response of the University and security to students when incidents occur. He suggested that perhaps a clause on surveillance activities should be inserted.

Ms Friesinger asked if a copy of the Demonstration Registration Form could be made available. Dr. Boisvert responded that the form has not yet been drafted but a copy could certainly be circulated for Council's input when available. The purpose of this form is to facilitate protests as the University can then work together, with the organizers, to avoid problems. He reminded Council that the organizers of any public protests or demonstrations are required to register with the City.

Concern was expressed how the University would deal with an "unregistered demonstration". Dr. Boisvert reiterated that the policy designates the Dean of Students as the contact in the case of a student demonstration. He pointed out that because the policy is flexible, this allows him some flexibility in dealing with any incident. He felt it was important that the policy have some "safeguards" built in.

Mr. Curran also felt that sometimes intervention occurs not because of a philosophical disagreement, but rather a response to possible security, health or safety issues. Dr. Boisvert stated that it is the Dean of Students or the Vice-Rector, Services (depending on the issue) who has administrative authority, not the staff that enforces them. He reminded Council that this policy would have jurisdiction over the whole university community - students, faculty and staff.

Mr. Gilmore asked if this draft policy could be circulated to other student groups. Dr Boisvert said the draft policy is a public document and student input is desired. Mr. Côté added that the primary focus was to protect the right of freedom of expression. Dr. Boisvert re-emphasized this. Mr. Jacob felt it was important that if there were changes made to this document at the level of Rector's Cabinet that the students have input at that time. Dr. Boisvert agreed that before Rectors Cabinet approves the policy, the students should be made aware of any changes to the policy and have the opportunity to respond.

Dr. Boisvert suggested that the draft policy be kept on the agenda for the February Council meeting. The CSU can then come back to Council at that time with their input in a more formalized manner. Dr. Boisvert would then give this response to the Vice-Rector, Services for presentation at Rector's Cabinet. Council was in agreement.

5. Reports

5.1 Dean of Students: Dr. Boisvert spoke briefly on the mandate of the Dean of Students office and the various services it offers. He explained that the Dean of Students oversees Student Services, which includes Advocacy & Support Services, Counselling & Development, Socio-Economic Services and Health Services. As the University's chief student affairs officer, the Dean of Students reports directly to the Vice-Rector, Services. The Dean of Students Office is the principal resource at the University for the interpretation and regulation of policies and procedures as these apply to the non-academic aspects of students' life. He is the liaison between the student groups and the university. He has a seat on all the major committees at the university. Due to the lack of service departments at Loyola, the office maintains an information centre at that campus. Dr. Boisvert felt strongly that the Dean of Students can and does play a meaningful role in the growth and education of our students and student associations.

5.2 Advocacy & Support Services: As Ms Kerby was not in attendance, the presentation was re-scheduled for the February Council meeting.

6. Student Life Issues

6.1 Accessibility Concerns: Dr. Boisvert drew Council's attention to the motion concerning accessibility that had been previously distributed. As Ms Kerby was not present, Ms Ryan, seconded by Mr. Côté moved the motion. Mr. Gilmore informed Council that he was presently working on an amendment to the motion. He asked that the motion be tabled until the February Council meeting. Council had no objection. Dr. Boisvert asked that the amendments be sent to the CCSL secretary, Ms Hackett, for distribution to Council before the February meeting.

6.2 VA Building: Ms Navidad spoke briefly about the deplorable state of the VA Building. With the continual deterioration of the building, she said it was not a safe or healthy environment for the students or the associations that inhabit the building. Ms Navidad asked if some of the anticipated Student Services surplus could be allocated to correct some of the more pressing problems. Speaking privileges

were granted to Ms J. Fowler who spoke on behalf of the Fine Arts students. Ms Fowler felt there were several main problems to be addressed: the sad state of VA Building, the deterioration of the VAV Gallery and the Reading Room. All these problems have contributed to the student frustrations with woefully inadequate facilities, critical health and safety problems and a lack of funding. She is aware that there is a proposal for a new Fine Arts Building but that will not be a reality for five to ten years. She felt it was important to deal with these issues now. Dr Boisvert agreed that these issues are critical but he said that the responsibility of the state of the building rests with the University not with Council. He also informed council that his office had committed funds to the VAV Gallery electrical upgrade. However, Ms Fowler felt it was important for CCSL to put pressure on the University to deal with the VA Building problems. Mr. Taylor agreed. He felt as Concordia has one of the largest Fine Arts Faculties in the country, the state of the Building is an embarrassment. Mr. Taylor, seconded by Ms Navidad made the following motion:

Be it resolved that CCSL strongly encourage the University and the Vice-Rector, Services to address the urgent and serious concerns of the Fine Arts students with respect to the poor physical state of the VA building, The VAV Gallery and the VA Reading Room.

Dr. Boisvert indicated the motion, if carried, would be sent to the Vice-Rector, Services with copies to Mr. Di Grappa. Facilities & Planning and to Dean Jackson, Fine Arts.

The motion was carried unanimously.

Ms Navidad asked if some funding from CCSL could be made available to address some of the concerns. Dr. Boisvert said that he and the Student Services Directors, in the context of budget discussions, were planning on coming to Council in February with a proposal on how the surplus may be allocated. This proposal would be presented for Council's approval. He felt sure that funding for the VA Reading Room could be considered at that time and asked if Council felt that was a viable solution. Council had no objection. Ms Hedrich reminded the students that applications for funding for student projects are available through Alumni Affairs. Mr. Côté asked if Occupational Health and Safety was aware of the safety issues in the VA Building. Dr. Boisvert replied that they were aware and confirmed that the immediate safety concerns were being addressed.

Mr. Curran announced that the pilot library project to keep the Webster Library open 24 hours a day for the period prior to examinations was so successful that it has been extended for a week. Data will be collected on this project and presented at the February CCSL meeting. He confirmed that the quiet rules and the regulations concerning food and drink in the Library have been strictly enforced. He also confirmed that the major renovations are completed for this year. Phase II of the renovations will commence in Spring 2000.

Ms Hedrich announced that the Alumni Office has developed an historical campus tour which should be up and running in Spring 2000. These tours will be especially important during orientation and convocation. The tours offer fascinating information about the University in an innovative way. Future plans may include

slide shows in the winter months and the implementation of "self-guided" tours. Ms Hedrich encouraged everyone to take a tour and learn about our university.

7. REPORT FROM THE CHAIR OF THE RECREATION & ATHLETICS BOARD
There was no report as Ms Kerby, Chair of the Board, was not present.

8. NEW BUSINESS

8.1 Profile, Vice Rector, Services: Dr. Boisvert drew Council's attention to the profile for Vice-Rector, Services which had been previously distributed. Dr. Boisvert noted that CCSL was not included as one of the assemblies encouraged to comment on the Profile of the ideal candidate. He felt this was a serious omission. Council was in agreement. Mr. Taylor said that he strongly resented the use of the words "client" or "customer" when referring to the student population in the profile. He felt the words were objectionable and commodified students. Ms Fowler agreed, adding that that issue had been raised at Fine Arts Council. Dr. Boisvert agreed to inform the Search Committee of the concerns expressed with respect to these two issues. Mr. Jacob questioned the large number of very different services that all report to the Vice-Rector, Services. Dr. Boisvert replied that concern is beyond CCSL's realm of responsibility. He suggested to Mr. Jacob that this issue should be raised with the Search Committee.

9. NEXT MEETING: Friday, February 4, 2000 Hall 769 10:00am

10. TERMINATION OF MEETING

A motion to terminate the meeting was made by Ms Navidad and seconded by Ms Ryan.

The Motion was carried unanimously